

## **Core Team/Stakeholders Committee Meeting**

### **State Resource Strategy Meeting**

**January 28, 2010**

**Idaho Panhandle National Forests Supervisor's Office**

**Coeur d'Alene, Idaho**

#### Core Team/Stakeholders Committee Members attending in Coeur d'Alene

- Steve Kimball, Idaho Department of Lands
- Dave Stephenson, Idaho Department of Lands
- Ara Andrea, Idaho State Technical Committee (NRCS)
- Ed Warner, Idaho Department of Lands – Forest Legacy Program
- Frank Gariglio, USDA – Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Mike Bowman, Idaho Community Forestry Advisory Council
- Serena Carlson, Intermountain Forest Association
- Chris Schnepf, University of Idaho Extension
- Kurt Mettler, Coeur d'Alene Tribe
- Craig Glazier, USFS - IPNF
- Jeff Handle, Idaho Parks and Recreation
- Tim Kastning, Cda Forest Coalition and Idaho Urban Forest and Advisory Comm.
- Kim Golden, NRCS and RC and D
- Mary Fritz, Idaho Department of Lands
- Kurt Pavlat, BLM

#### Core Team/ Stakeholders Committee Members attending remotely:

- Bob Unnasch, The Nature Conservancy (NFFC/Boise)
- Cindi Lane, Forest Service: Clearwater, Nez Perce/ Payette National Forests (Kamiah)
- Greg Servheen, Idaho Dept of Fish and Wildlife (Boise/NFFC)

#### Committee Staff Attendees:

- Andrew Mock, Idaho Department of Lands; GIS Analyst
- Jill Cobb, USDA Forest Service-IPNF and IDL, Note Taker

### **Welcome/Introductions/Agenda**

Steve welcomed everyone and followed with a round of introductions. Next he highlighted the meeting Agenda.

- 1) Discuss feedback on Draft Priority Areas and Refine Priority Areas.
- 2) Review/Refine Statewide Goals and Strategies (using work begun at the Oct. 29 meeting). These are goals and general strategies that can apply to all or most Priority Areas.

### 3) Identify Area-specific Strategies and Goals for North Panhandle and Coeur d'Alene Basin Areas.

Steve updated the group and let them know that we were about half way through the strategy effort. Our current task is closely examine specific areas and evaluate unique needs and opportunities.

Steve spent a few moments reviewing the upcoming meetings and timeline. On February 8<sup>th</sup>, a meeting is planned with our stakeholder group to make sure that we are meeting their expectations. While the stakeholder meeting is important, he reminded all attendees that because of the tight timeline, all of the participants needed to stay actively engaged with each of the future core team meetings as well.

One focus of the State Strategy is to highlight those activities planned to occur in the next five years. Ultimately, the strategy will help identify and encourage potential partnerships to achieve shared objectives. Identifying specific goals and strategies for high priority areas will facilitate coordination of partnerships and will prioritize projects and funding.

Steve received little feedback on priority areas. In total, we identified about 14 areas and we sent out map showing those areas and associated talking points. Steve shared that he had received a few supportive e-mail responses. There were no suggestions to adjust the current delineations.

Serena said that she received comments from the Shoshone County commissioners. They noticed that their county was split between two priority areas and would prefer to not be split. Additionally, the commissioners felt that their fire danger is higher than indicated. Steve said if Priority Area boundaries make sense with regard to issues and happen to split counties we should be able to mitigate any issues with that in the Strategy. Dave added that while the fire danger may be high in Shoshone County it is not as high relative to other parts of the State.

Mike Bowman shared additional concerns. He had found a couple of documents (NRCS document titled a Watershed Concern Document (dated Dec. 2006) and the ICEMP) that strongly resembled our efforts. He is concerned that we may be duplicating efforts. After some discussion, it was felt that there are similarities but not a problematic duplication of efforts. Mike also suggested that we try to get additional tribal involvement. He also suggested that we develop a media plan prior to sharing the report with the general public.

In response to Mike's concerns, Frank said that the NRCS report was a completed out of the State Office under the supervision of Janet Holey. Steve will contact the NRCS and see if some of their strategies could be folded into this effort. As far as the tribal

involvement, Steve is working to contact the Shoshone Bannock tribal representatives and ask for their participation.

Serena asked for the cutoff date for feedback. Comments will be welcome throughout this effort- the Strategy is dynamic and iterative. There are key times in the process when feedback is most helpful and we'll highlight those times.

Mary Fritz talked to Shelley Landry of Representative Walt Minnick's office. The Congressman's staff asked if we could identify areas on federally managed grounds that are "unencumbered" for treatment. There was some discussion as to what "unencumbered" really meant. Opportunities for coalition development should be a priority. Cindi Lane responded for the FS and said that all Forest Plans in Idaho are in the process of revision. After the FS plans are completed, there will be a better idea about resource allocation and development on NF lands. Steve asked Cindi how we could reflect management goals (e.g. Timber management) in the Strategy process. Steve asked the larger group if we should refine strategies by land ownership. Cindi cautioned the group to pay attention to Idaho Roadless Rule for fire and harvests. Steve suggested that for the pre-work for Feb. Mtg that we secure information regarding management allocations and ownerships. Using this information, we can discuss SAFR threats and benefits as well as management strategies for specific landowners. Andrew added that it was not part of the original design of the SAFR/Strategy to be emphasizing ownership boundaries. Steve agreed but said he felt we need to be aware of ownership and associated management goals and constraints to create useful strategies.

Kurt asked about Auger Falls as a new Priority area on the most recent map. Dave Stephenson proposed this be added because it has rapid growth and that growth has the potential to affect forest resources. Question was raised as to whether it really had to stand alone or could it be added to Jerome and Twin Falls. Another suggestion was to create a grouping of similar areas and just call it something like "Community Forestry Complex". Discussion was extensive about whether this "new" priority area really fell within the confines of our original approach. A concern was raised that we need to clearly communicate that we are looking at both Forests (by rainfall) and Urban Forests. Question was raised as to whether Lewiston is not a similar situation and if we could just lump all the Urban Forests together with a similar color. This discussion spawned many suggestions regarding Lewiston and its delineation. Steve said we should step back and look for driving issues for Lewiston and Auger Falls. Are there are issues that should drive us to look more closely at the urban areas. The decision was to highlight Lewiston as an Urban Forestry Area.

What about the Auger Falls delineation? The decision was made to "halo" Auger Falls with Jerome and Twin Falls and focus its discussion on Urban Forestry Issues.

The group was asked if there were any other priority area concerns? A suggestion was to look at the communities of Nez Perce and Payette. Steve asked our community forestry specialists (Dave, Mike and Tim) to check around and see statewide importance of communities and identify which other communities should be haloed. Mary asked for refinement to include urban areas within watersheds?

The group spent time updating and refining the strategy priority table that is available as a separate document. After a lunch break, Steve urged the group to look for priority areas within priority areas that should be given attention within next five years.

## **Northern Panhandle Priority Area**

Dave and Andrew gave brief reviews of the threats and benefits associated with the Northern Panhandle Priority area.

The highlights for the Northern Panhandle Priority Area were the following:

- Forest markets are high in whole area
- Air Concerns are only high in Sandpoint.
- Forest health threats are high
- Fire risks are moderate to high because of population and WUI areas
- Biodiversity is high to moderate: Wildlife (Grizzly, Lynx, Sturgeon, Burbot, Wolves, Bull trout, Caribou,) Wildlife corridors at Boundary Creek, McArthur Lake
- Water quality is moderate to high (TMDLs, Municipal water supplies (Myrtle Creek and Sand Creek), Tristate water council, Ponderary Water Watchers, Milfoil and other non-natives, storm water
- Privately owned Timber Interests (Stimson, Idaho Forest group, IFI, IAP)
- Coordination with Washington and Montana.
- Ownership mostly federal and private.
- Limited mills left and concern that industry is dying.
- Land trusts and Conservation Easements. (Vital Ground, Clark Fork Conservancy, Family Forests are 40% of the ownership, NRCS wetland programs, McArthur Lakes
- Existing Coalitions/community efforts: Sandpoint is open to becoming a sustainable growth community, Priest Community Forest Connection, Winter Knights. Scotchman Peaks Group
- Tourism
- Unique Areas/Features: Experimental Forests. Roadless and Wilderness. Sundance fire. Canadian Border.

Inventory of Existing Plans for Northern Panhandle: Group identified existing plans for the Northern Panhandle. Greg (WDFW) provided the following list of plans:

- Lake Pend Oreille Bull Trout Conservation Strategy
- Clark Fork Management Committee (Avista/FERC/stakeholders)
- Native Salmonid Restoration Plan
- Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative
- Burbot strategy
- Grizzly-bear subcommittee
- Forestry subcommittee
- Wetlands strategy
- Kootenai River White Sturgeon Recovery Plan
- Kootenai Subbasin Plan (BPA)
- County Plans
- Boundary/Smith WMA Management Committee
- WMA management plan
- Selkirk/Cabinet –Yaak IGBC subcommittee (grizzly bears)
- IGBC recovery plan
- IPNF plan
- Kootenai NF plan
- Caribou Recovery Plan
- Bull Trout Recovery Plan
- Pend Oreille Basin Commission
- Minnick collaborative (maybe)

Greg suggested that we contact the following people from IDFG for additional information: Wayne Wakkinen, Mary Terra Berns and Chip Corsi

The group brainstormed and came up with additional plans to assess for projects. It is critical for everyone to remember to focus upon what is going on in the next five years that is tangible. Names were assigned to research plans more thoroughly.

- County Wildfire Protection Plans: Craig reviewed for the group. For both counties the federal and county plans line up well.
- Boundary County List
- Bonner County List
- Idaho State Parks with Natural Resource Management Plans (Jeff)
- Forest Asset Management (FAM) Plan for IDL (Ara)
- Watershed Advisory Groups: (Jill)
- Privately owned commercial forests (e.g. Forest Capitol Purchase). (Serena)
- Army Corps of Engineers (Jill)
- Soil and Water Conservation Plans (NRCS) Frank

- Ed Pomeranian NRCS new district board member
- State Highway vegetation Treatments. (Mary Terra Burns Fish and Game and DOT) (Steve)
- Forest Stewardship Plans (Ara).
- Department of Transportation (emphasis on public safety) (Steve and Tim)
- City Urban Forests. Call Parks and Recreation in Sandpoint. Ask about Canopy Retention/Forest health. (Tim)
- Community Comprehensive Plans for Counties (Steve)
- Panhandle Lake RC and D: Kim Golden (Frank)
- Nurseries (Mike)
- Priest River Development Corporation (Mary)
- Priest Community Forest Connections (Mary)
- KVRI (Mary)
- N Idaho Renewable energy commission (Mary)
- Kalispell Tribe (Steve)
- Kootenai and Salish (Steve)
- Elk Foundation (Craig)
- Idaho Rural Partnership (Dave)
- Avista and PUD (Steve)
- Cumulative Watershed Plans (Ara)
- TMDL Plans (Andrew)
- County Commissioners (Steve)
- Recreational Plans (Tim)

(Bob Unnasch with Nature Conservancy joined us at 1:35 pm)

**What are the information gaps and/or financial and information challenges that currently exist in the Northern Panhandle?**

1. Encourage Collaborative Groups
  - a. Make it easier for groups to form. (i.e. help facilitate meetings)
  - b. Sustain existing groups. Use grant money to support facilitation.
2. Identify Conflicting strategies
  - a. Consider using collaborative groups
  - b. Create pipelines of cash for replacing culverts
3. Develop a strategy to secure and easily disperse funds
  - a. Awareness of Cost Share money
  - b. Get projects to pay for themselves. (Forest Stewardship or volunteers)
  - c. Look at partnerships with State and Private Forestry and/or Tribes

4. Consider connectivity to adjoining States. (Fire, Stream flow, Fisheries, Wildlife)
  - a. Clark Fork Coalition
  - b. Clark Fork Cooperatives
  - c. Salmon Recovery Funding Board
  - d. Fish and Game and Delta Restoration
  - e. Washington DNR, WSU extension,
  - f. Washington State Assessment (Steve and Dave)
  - g. Montana State Assessment (Steve and Mary)

Mary asked if there was an overall opportunity to address future grants. Would the group consider a request for proposals that would meet high priority needs? For example, could the strategy help fund a large project spanning a large geographic areas or fund a needs assessment over a large area?

## **Coeur d'Alene Basin**

Dave and Andrew gave brief reviews of the threats and benefits associated with the Couer d'Alene Priority area.

The highlights for the Couer d'Alene Basin were the following:

- Silver Valley Superfund Site
- Forest Markets are high, lots of closed mills. Timber/ chips crossing the borders.
- WL biodiversity is not as high as it is at north.
- Water quality is high. Spokane Aquifer (sole source of water for half million people)
- Wildfire concern is huge.
- Major issue with growth pressure (very heavy along I-90 corridor, around the lake, I-95 corridor). Very close to Spokane
- Lots of Forest Health disease/focus on root disease.
- Air Quality: whole area could be close to non-attainment.
- Shoshone County is trying to get Co-gen plant.
- Major transportation Cross roads.
- Good entry for invasive species.
- Major Recreation and is heavily used by Spokane residents.

### Inventory of Existing Plans for Coeur d'Alene Basin

- Ask Greg Servheen for a listing of plans such as he presented for the Northern Panhandle Priority Group (Steve)
- Urban Forestry Plans: Hayden Lake , Postfalls and CDA (Dave)
- Silver Valley Urban Forestry Plan (Tim)

- TMDL (Andrew)
- Heyburn Park (Jeff)
- NRCS Bob: No conservation action plans for this area.
- Legacy Assessment of Needs (Ed)
- Recreational plan for North Fork of CDA (Ed)
- County Wildfire Protection Plans (Craig)
- CDA Lake management plan...DEQ and Tribe (Serena)
- County Comprehensive Plan Shoshone and Kootenai (Serena)
- FAM (Ara)
- CDA Sports Coalition (Tim)
- Forest Service Planned Activities (Steve)
- CDA Tribe (Kurt)
- CROP: Coordinated resource operating Protocol (Mary)
- Community Canopy (David)
- Lands Council (Jill)

**What are the information gaps and/or financial and information challenges that currently exist in the Couer d'Alene Basin?**

- Root disease
- Catastrophic Wildfire (Fire Smart, Fire wise)
- Phosphorous loading in the lake
- Growth and recreation use
- Loss of open space
- Part of our strategy is to provide incentives to keep property forested
- Stronger land trust opportunities. Inland NW Land Trust. Forest Legacy Program)
- Is there a local smart growth group? Not sure?
- Growth is moving into the forests. How do we transition from one type of forest management into another?
- Big issue is road development
- Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization ( Andrew)
- Educate and encourage smart growth. Growing number of folks who are working these smaller acreages. Can we provide education and support? SEEP program.
- Maintaining natural forest ecosystem and encourage retaining trees
- Work with AVISTA to plant trees around home.
- CDA tribe: Putting fuel break around St. Maries and upsizing culverts in Lake Creek, Boulder, Benewah and Evans (Kurt)

**Steve summarized the meeting and reviewed the upcoming meetings.**



Feb 8<sup>th</sup> Stakeholder Mtg: Scheduled from 1:00 to 3:00 (PST) at the Forest Service IPNF Supervisor's Office. Boise and Moscow will be on video. Other folks can call in to access the meeting. Need feedback from Stakeholders before we proceed.

Feb 18<sup>th</sup> /19<sup>th</sup> Mtg: Scheduled from 9:00 to 3:00 (PST) at the Forest Service Fernan Office.. Frank suggested that we ask each contact for a list of plans. Need to look over talking points again. Steve will take Frank's forms to make a standard form to hand out to all interviewers. Steve will send list of contacts and will ask for volunteers to make those needed contacts. On average, most folks spent 10 or 15 minutes per interview. Mary shared a succinct handout that she used to focus the discussion. Question was raised as to whether or not we could reserve a site in Moscow so that we could include the Clearwater folks on this meeting. Steve said he would research availability of a facility. Another question was raised as to how to include environmental groups. Steve responded that we have included them as stakeholders.

**Critical Dates to Mark on the Calendar:** *(Each of the Goals and Strategy meetings will begin at 9:00 am)*

February 8<sup>th</sup>: Stakeholder meeting will be held on the afternoon from 1:00 to 3:00 pm (PST).

February 18<sup>th</sup>: Palouse, St Joe/Clearwater and Bitterroot Corridor Goals and Strategy Meeting

February 19<sup>th</sup>: Craig-Camas and West Central Idaho Goals and Strategy Meeting

March 9<sup>th</sup>: Boise, Snake and Wood River Goals and Strategy Meeting

March 10<sup>th</sup>: Lemhi-Paseneroi and Sawtooth, Teton-Westslope, East Idaho Greater Idaho Falls Goals and Strategy Meeting

Notes Recorded by Jill Cobb and Finalized by Steve Kimball